## REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The Applicants respond to the restriction requirement of the Office Action of July 18, 2008, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111. The Applicants submit a separate request for a one month extension of time with this response.

Claims 1 through 52 are pending in the application. No changes are made to the claims as presented in the Applicants' Preliminary Amendment of June 19, 2006. No additional fee is due for claims.

## Response to Restriction Requirement

The Examiner applies a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 and § 372 to elect an invention for examination. Specifically the Examiner requires the Applicants to elect between four groups of claims.

The Applicants elect the claims of Group I to the compound of formula (1) wherein B is an arylene or naphthalene with traverse. These claims include claims 1 through 47.

The Applicants elect the species of Compound 3 for examination. This species is found in the specification on page 28, and its unexpected results are described on pages 38 through 41. Claims 1 through 12, 19 through 28, 34 through 36, and 39 through 47 encompass this species.

The election requirement is believed to be in error because the invention includes a generic formula. Examination of the generic formula would encompass all species. The bases for this fact are found in the PCT published application on pages 3 through 21. This common

Application Number 10/583,567 Response to Restriction Requirement of July 18, 2008 Response dated September 18, 2008

generic formula should prevent additional searching. This restriction requirement should be removed.

There is no change in inventorship caused by this election.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Grandinetti

Registration No. 30,754

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone (212) 382-0700